



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,427	06/04/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008209-1	5675

7590

09/20/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BENGZON, GREG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,427

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

Greg Bengzon

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11 and 14-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11 and 14-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

SB

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 9, 10, 12, and 13 have been cancelled. Claims 36 and 37 are new. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 11, 16, 22, 28, 29, 31, and 35 have been amended. As such, Claims 1-8, 11, and 14-37 are now pending in this application.

Priority

The effective date of the claims described in this application is June 4, 2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8, 11, 15-22, 24-27, 29-34, 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Levine et al. (US Patent 5974234) hereinafter referred to as Levine .

With respect to Claim 1 (as amended) , Levine disclosed a method for representing production devices on a network, (Figure 5, Column 5 Lines 25-45) the method comprising: hosting an interface for one or more production devices, each interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for a

Art Unit: 2144

document;(Column 15 Lines 45-65) providing the interface for a selected one of the production device to a client upon receipt from the client of a production request for the target document; (Column 14 Lines 25-35) and managing the production of the target document for the selected production device using production options selected through the interface. (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 4 Lines 55-65, Column 13 Lines 5-20, Column 8 Lines 55-65)

With respect to Claim 2, Levine disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising detecting new production devices connected to the network, and hosting an interface for each new production device. (Column 11 Lines 35-45, Column 12 Lines 15-25)

With respect to Claim 3 (as amended) , Levine disclosed the method of claim 2, further comprising: acquiring production logic for each detected production device, the production logic including data for generating a user interface having particular controls for selecting production options for that detected production device; (Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) using the production logic for each detected device, generating an interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for and directing production of a document on that detected production device; and associating the generated interface with a network address. (Figure 7, Column 13 Lines 40-65, Column 14 Lines 60-65, Column 15 Lines 1-25)

With respect to Claim 4, Levine disclosed the method of claim 3, wherein the act of acquiring comprises identifying the new device and acquiring production logic for the identified device from a device information service. (Column 13 Lines 40-65)

With respect to Claim 5, Levine disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein each interface is a web page associated with a network address, the act of hosting comprises hosting each interface on a web server, and the act of providing comprises providing the interface to a web browser. (Figure 4, Column 4 Lines 1-35, Column 13 Lines 5-20, Column 10 Lines 5-20, Column 8 Lines 1-25)

With respect to Claim 6, Levine disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the interface is hosted and production of the document is managed on a device other than the production device. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65)

With respect to Claim 7, Levine disclosed (currently amended) A method for representing production devices on a network, the method comprising: (Figure 5 Column 5 Lines 25-35) detecting new production devices connected to the network; using (tie production logic for each detected device, (Column 11 Lines 35-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 10 Lines 5-35, Column 10 Lines 45-55) generating an interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for and directing production of a document on that detected production device; (Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) hosting the generated interface for each

Art Unit: 2144

production device; providing the interface for a particular production device to a client upon receipt from the client of a production request for a target document; and managing the production of the target document for the particular production device using production options selected through the interface. (Column 7 Lines 45-50)

With respect to Claim 8 , Levine disclosed a method for managing electronic document production over a computer network, the method comprising: accessing a proxy service for a production device; the proxy service, returning an interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for a document; (Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) returning selected production options to the proxy service; and the proxy service managing production of the document for the production device using production options selected through the interface.(Figure 5, Column 10 Lines 45-65, Column 11 Lines 5-25)

With respect to Claim 11 , Levine disclosed (original) the method of Claim 8, wherein the proxy service includes a web server and the interface is a web page; and the act of returning includes returning the web page. (Column 10 Lines 20-35, Column 13 Lines 5-25)

Art Unit: 2144

With respect to Claim 15, Levine disclosed the method of claim 8, wherein the proxy service operates on a device other than the production device. (Figure 5 Column 10 Lines 20-35)

Levine disclosed Claim 16. (currently amended) A computer program product for managing electronic document production over a computer network, the product comprising a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions thereon for: (Figure 5, Column 5 Lines 25-45) receiving, from a client, a production request for a production device for a target document: (Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) in response to the production request, returning to the client an interface for the production device, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for the target a document; managing the production of the target document using production options selected through the interface. (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 17. (original) The product of Claim 16, further comprising instructions for acquiring a target document and wherein the instructions for returning and managing comprise instructions for returning an interface for selecting production options for the target document and managing production of the target document. (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 18. (original) The product of Claim 16, further comprising instructions for detecting new production devices and generating an interface for each

Art Unit: 2144

new production device detected. (Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 19. (original) The product of Claim 16, further comprising instructions for identifying each new production device detected and acquiring production logic used to generate an interface for that production device. (Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 20. (original) The product of Claim 19, wherein the instructions for acquiring the production logic comprise instructions for acquiring the production logic from a device information service. (Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 21. (original) The product of Claim 16, wherein the instructions for receiving and managing comprise instructions for receiving and managing to be executed by a device other than the production device. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 22. (currently amended) A system for representing production devices on a network, comprising: a database containing production logic for one or more production devices, the production logic for each production device including data for generating a user interface having particular controls for selecting production options; (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) an interface generator operable to access production logic for a production device in the database and, following receipt of a production request for a target document, to serve an interface for the production device, the interface, (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) being generated according to the accessed production logic, having user accessible controls for selecting production options for the target document; and a production engine, in electronic communication with the interface generator, the production engine operable to manage production of the target document for the production device using production options selected through the interface. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 24. (original) The system of Claim 22, further comprising a service engine operable to detect new production devices and to acquire production logic for each the detected production device. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 25. (original) The system of Claim 24, wherein the service engine includes: a device locator operable to detect and identify new devices present on the network; and an update service operable to acquire the production logic for each of the detected devices and update the database with the acquired production logic. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 26. (original) The system of Claim 22, wherein the interface generator is a web server and the interface is a web page. (Column 10 Lines 20-35, Column 13 Lines 5-25)

With respect to Claim 27, Levine disclosed the system of claim 22, wherein the interface generator and the production engine each operate on a device other than the production device. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35)

Levine disclosed Claim 29. (currently amended) In a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production over a computer network, the system comprising: one or more production devices; a client operable to identify a target document, (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) select one of the one or more production devices, and direct a production request to the selected production device ; a proxy service in electronic communication with the client and the production device, the proxy service operable to return, in response to receiving a production request, (Column

Art Unit: 2144

4 Lines 55-65) to the client an interface for selecting production options for the selected production device and to manage the production of the target document for the selected production device using production options selected through the interface.(Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 30. (original) The system of Claim 29 wherein the proxy service includes a web server, the interface is a web page, and the client is a web browser. (Column 10 Lines 20-35, Column 13 Lines 5-25)

Levine disclosed Claim 31. (currently amended) The system of Claim 29, wherein the proxy service includes: a database containing production logic for at least one of the one or more production devices, (Column 10 Lines 45-65) the production logic for a given production device including data for generating a user interface having particular controls for selecting production options for that production device; (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) an interface generator operable to access the production logic in the database and serve the interface for the selected production device, the interface being generated according to the production logic for the selected production device; and a production engine operable to manacle production of the document on the production device in accordance with the selected production options. (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 32. (original) The system of Claim 29, further comprising: a device locator operable to detect and identify new production devices present on the network; and an update service operable to acquire the production logic for each of the detected devices and update the database with the acquired production logic.

(Column 12 Lines 15-35 , Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 33. (original) The system of Claim 29 wherein the client operates on a first network device and the proxy service operates on a second network device different from the first network device. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 34. (original) The system of Claim 29, wherein the proxy service operates on a device other than the selected production device. (Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 36. (new) The method of Claim 1, wherein each interface has user accessible controls for identifying a target document and for selecting production options for the target document, and wherein managing comprises managing, for the selected production device, the production of the target document identified through the interface using production options selected through the interface. (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Levine disclosed Claim 37. (new) The product of Claim 16, wherein: the instructions for returning comprise instructions for returning to the client an interface for the production device, the interface having user accessible controls for identifying the target document and for selecting production options for the target document; (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) the instructions for managing comprise instructions for managing the production of the target document identified through the interface using production options selected through the interface. (Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14, 23, 28 and 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine (US Patent 5974234) further in view of Goodman et al. (US Patent 6757071) hereinafter referred to as Goodman .

While Levine substantially disclosed the invention, Levine did not clearly disclose the method of Claim 14 further comprising identifying the document before accessing the proxy service; wherein the interface also includes a user accessible control or controls for identifying the document; wherein the act of managing includes merging the document with the selected production options into a production plan and delivering the production plan in a device-understood format to the production device. Levine did not clearly disclose the system of Claim 28 with a plan generator operable to merge the document with the production options selected through the interface.

The Examiner notes that while the Levine patent describes user interfaces for the production device and sending processing instructions to the production device, the aforementioned features are not clearly explained by the Levine patent, with these features concerning the preview of the document and the manual, interactive or automatic modification and selection of printing options, depending on the user's desires and the characteristics of the production device. However since Levine was concerned with processing of print documents with print options, Levine would have been motivated to look for other disclosures regarding said processing of print documents, such as Goodman.

Goodman describes a system and method providing an intelligent printer driver and user interface. The Goodman patent clearly indicates the target document is identified before accessing the proxy server, since a production device driver is selected based on the target document characteristics. The Goodman patent detects the contents of the document, uses a recommendation module that plans for the production of the document, presents possible modifications options to the user and presents a preview of the modified documents via a user interface. The Goodman patent allows the user to proceed or cancel the printing process. (Goodman - Figures 4 and 5, Column 2 Lines 20-55, Column 5 Lines 10-65, Column 6 Lines 5-20)

Levine and Goodman are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding networked production device systems that provide automated

device driver lookup and installation. It is respectfully suggested that at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the printer detector, content detector, compatibility determination module, recommendation module and user interface module described by Goodman into the system described by Levine . The suggested motivation would have been, as Goodman suggests (Goodman - Column 1 Lines 15-65), to enable to user to take advantage of the growing complexity of production devices, especially colored printers, while shielding the users from difficulty in determining which devices to use given the multitude of devices and compatibility issues. Goodman mentions that because of differences in the printer characteristics it is often difficult to print color images which are perceived as accurate reproductions of the displayed color images. The combination of Goodman and Levine also allows document to be sent electronically to different users and printed out in different devices without loss of image quality. Goodman further mentions the advantage of an intelligent driver system when printing black and white documents from color images.

The combination of Levine and Goodman disclosed Claim 14. (original) The method of Claim 8, wherein the act of managing includes merging the document with the selected production options into a production plan and delivering the production plan in a device-understood format to the production device. (Goodman - Figures 4 and 5, Column 2 Lines 20-55, Column 5 Lines 10-65, Column 6 Lines 5-20)

The combination of Levine and Goodman disclosed Claim 23 - the system of Claim 22, wherein the production engine includes: a device driver operable deliver the production plan to the production device, (Levine - Column 10 Lines 20-65) wherein the production engine includes; a plan generator operable to merge the document with the production options selected through the interface. (Goodman - Figures 4 and 5, Column 2 Lines 20-55, Column 5 Lines 10-65, Column 6 Lines 5-20)

The combination of Levine and Goodman disclosed Claim 28. (currently amended) A system for representing production devices on a network, comprising: a database containing production logic for one or more production devices, the production logic for each production device including data for generating a user interface having particular controls or selecting production options; (Levine - Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) a device locator operable to detect and identify new devices present on the network; (Levine - Figure 5, Column 8 Lines 45-65, Column 12 Lines 15-35, Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) an update service operable to acquire the production logic for each of the detected devices and update the database with the acquired production logic; an interface generator operable to access the production logic for a production device in the database and serve an interface for the production device, (Levine - Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) the

Art Unit: 2144

interface being generated to include user accessible controls for selecting production options for a document as specified by the production logic for that production device; and a device driver operable to deliver the production plan to the production device, (Levine - Column 10 Lines 30-65) a plan generator operable to merge the document with production options selected through the interface. (Goodman - Figures 4 and 5, Column 2 Lines 20-55, Column 5 Lines 10-65, Column 6 Lines 5-20)

The combination of Levine and Goodman disclosed Claim 35. (currently amended) In a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production over a computer network, the system comprising: one or more production devices; a database containing production logic for one or more production devices, (Levine - Column 10 Lines 45-65) the production logic for a given production device including data for generating user interface having particular controls for selecting production options for that production device; (Levine -Column 12 Lines 15-35 , Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) a device locator operable to detect and identify new devices present on the network; (Levine - Column 12 Lines 15-35 , Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) an update service operable to acquire the production logic for each of the detected devices and update the database with the acquired production logic; a client operable to identify a target document, select one of the one or more production devices, and direct a production request to the selected production device ; (Levine -

Column 7 Lines 45-50, Column 14 Lines 25-35, Column 15 Lines 45-65) an interface generator operable to access the production logic for the selected production device in the database and serve an interface for the selected production device, the interface being generated to include user accessible controls for selecting production options for the target document as specified by the production logic for that production device; and a device driver operable deliver the production plan to the production device, (Levine - Column 10 Lines 45-65) a plan generator operable to acquire the target document and merge it with production options selected through the interface forming a production plan. (Goodman - Figures 4 and 5, Column 2 Lines 20-55, Column 5 Lines 10-65, Column 6 Lines 5-20)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/03/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reasons for non-persuasiveness are set forth below.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

The Applicant suggests that the Examiners position is flawed as Levine did not teach or suggest providing an interface upon receipt of a production request for a target document in the manner required by Claim 1. Levine also fails to teach or suggest

Art Unit: 2144

managing the production of the target document using production options selected through the interface in the manner required by Claim 1. Simply stated, Levine mentions nothing of providing an interface upon receipt of a production request for a target document, nor does Levine teach managing the target document using production options selected through the interface.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. In Column 11 Lines 5-20 Levine described a communications interface , while in Column 15 Lines 45-65 Levine described an API for issuing job management commands using function calls and Get/Set operations. In Column 9 Lines 55 –65 Levine described a Mark Service and a User Interface associated with the printer device. In Column 13 Lines 15-20 Levine disclosed retrieving a web page for the particular printing device and returning the page to the client. Thus Levine disclosed an interface upon receipt of a production request for a target document and managing the target document using production options selected through the interface.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

The Applicant suggests that Levine's job management commands are limited to commands that affect jobs already in a queue, and are therefore not applicable to the invention.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner highlights Column 15 Lines 65 wherein Levine stated that 'To the calling program, it doesn't make any difference where the job is in a server queue or at the device. The [function] call is the same.'

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the location of the target document and/or print job) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [*in italics*]:

Claim 7 requires providing an interface upon receipt of a production request for a target document and then managing the production of the target document using production options selected through the interface. As made clear above with respect to Claim 1, the Applicant suggests that Levine did not teach these elements. For at least these reasons, Claim 7 is felt to distinguish over Levine.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. In Column 11 Lines 5-20 Levine described a communications interface , while in Column 15 Lines 45-65 Levine described an API for issuing job management commands using function calls and Get/Set operations. In Column 9 Lines 55 –65 Levine described a Mark Service and a

Art Unit: 2144

User Interface associated with the printer device. In Column 13 Lines 15-20 Levine disclosed retrieving a web page for the particular printing device and returning the page to the client.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

The Applicant suggests that Levine mentions nothing of providing a user interface that includes controls for identifying a target document, nor does Levine teach managing production of an identified target document for the production device using production options selected through that interface. For at least these reasons, Claim 8 is felt to distinguish over Levine, Claims 11, 14, and 15 are also felt to distinguish over Levine based at least on their dependency from Claim 8.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. In Column 11 Lines 5-20 Levine described a communications interface , while in Column 15 Lines 45-65 Levine described an API for issuing job management commands using function calls and Get/Set operations. In Column 9 Lines 55 –65 Levine described a Mark Service and a User Interface associated with the printer device. In Column 13 Lines 15-20 Levine disclosed retrieving a web page for the particular printing device and returning the page to the client.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

Levine mentions nothing of returning a user interface in response to a production request for a target document where the user interface includes controls for selecting production options for the target document. Levine also did not teach managing production of a target document using production options selected through that interface. For at least these reasons, Claim 16 is felt to distinguish over Levine. Claims 17-21 and 37 are also felt to distinguish over Levine based at least on their dependency from Claim 16.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. In Column 11 Lines 5-20 Levine described a communications interface , while in Column 15 Lines 45-65 Levine described an API for issuing job management commands using function calls and Get/Set operations. In Column 9 Lines 55 –65 Levine described a Mark Service and a User Interface associated with the printer device. In Column 13 Lines 15-20 Levine disclosed retrieving a web page for the particular printing device and returning the page to the client.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

The Applicant suggests that Levine simply fails to teach system components capable of accessing and using production logic that includes data for generating a user interface having particular controls for selecting production options. Moreover, Levine fails to teach a production engine that is operable to manage production of a target document using production options selected through an interface generated using the production logic. For at least these reasons Claim 22 is felt to distinguish over Levine.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant regarding user interfaces for reasons stated above. Regarding a production engine, the Examiner refers the Applicant to Figure 4 and Column 9 Lines 1-65, where Levine disclosed of Document Processing and a document producer.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

The Applicant suggests that Levine simply fails to teach a proxy service that is operable, in response to receiving a production request, to return to a client an interface for selecting production options for a selected production device for the selected production device. Moreover, Levine fails to teach a proxy service that is operable to manage the production of the target document for the selected production device using production options selected through the interface. For at least these reasons, Claim 29 is felt to distinguish over Levine.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant regarding user interfaces for reasons stated above. Regarding a proxy service, in Column 10 Lines 20-65 and Column 13 Lines 20 Levine disclosed of a proxy server returning a web page to the client.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

The Examiner rejected Claim 28 asserting that Levine teaches the first four elements while admitting that Levine did not teach a plan generator. For this, the

Examiner relies on Goodman. The Examiner did not even address the requirement of a device driver. As above with respect to Claim 22, Levine simply fails to teach system components (an interface generator) capable of accessing and using production logic that includes data for generating a user interface having particular controls for selecting production options. For at least this reason, Claim 28 is felt to distinguish over Levine and Goodman.

The Examiner rejected Claim 35 asserting that Levine teaches each element except for a plan generator. As for that element, the Examiner relies on Goodman. The Applicant suggests that the Examiner did not even address the requirement of a device driver.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. In Column 10 Lines 45-65 Levine disclosed of a device data cache and device/user database that stores relevant information, including device drivers. In Column 15 Lines 15-45 Levine disclosed of installing said device drivers as required. Regarding interface generators, in Column 13 Lines 5-20 Levine disclosed of presenting a web page to the client.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to the enclosed PTO-892 form.

US 6762771 B1 Niki; Toru et al. - provides a user with several selectable options for printing a selected file.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Bengzon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571)272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


gcb


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100